



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,847	09/27/2000	Yoichi Okano	FQ5-488	6526
21254	7590	07/22/2004	EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			JAMAL, ALEXANDER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	(6)

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/669,847	OKANO, YOICHI
	Examiner Alexander Jamal	Art Unit 2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: PTOL-413B

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawal of Rejections

1. Based upon the submitted amendments (filed 5-5-2004), examiner withdraws USC 35 112 first paragraph rejections to claims 1-20,26 from the prior office action (July 8th, 2003).
2. Examiner notes that the previous office action sent (paper number 13 mailed 3-2-2004) has been vacated (please see attached form PTOL-413B) "Examiner Initiated Interview Summary".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1,3-7,15,18,21,22,25** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nazanin et al. (5625683).

As per **claim 1**, Nazanin discloses a mobile telephone (ABSTRACT) with an alert function. The telephone allows the user to set a pre-determined time duration relative to

the end of a call (last-communication time) (Col 3 lines 18-35, 60-67). The 'current time-of-day' referred to by Nazanin will be the last communication time of day (ie. when the call is terminated) when the user is to be reminded that a period of time has passed (Col 3 lines 63-66). The unit comprises memory 207 (Fig. 2) that stores the various times/time durations (col 2 lines 20-30). The unit must inherently store the last communication time for the purpose of allowing the device to convert the 'period of time' (relative to the last communication time) to an hour and minute format. Once the time interval has elapsed, the user is alerted (Col 2 lines 44-52).

As per **claim 18**, Nazanin discloses a device having an alert function that performs the functions described in the rejection of claim 1.

As per **claims 21,22**, claims rejected for same reasons as rejection of claim 1.

As per **claims 25**, claims rejected for same reasons as rejection of claim 18.

As per **claim 3**, the device reads the current time (Col 2 lines 12-25). The steps of converting a 'period of time' to a 'time of day' to call based upon the last communication time (Col 3 lines 63-67), and then comparing that time to the current time of day is the same as calculating an elapsed time from the last communication time to the current time, and determining whether the elapsed time exceeds the predetermined time interval.

As per **claim 4**, when a person is initially called, the last communication time (time-to-call) is initially set to a time at the same time data relating to the person is registered into the phonebook database (Col 2 lines 20-30).

As per **claim 5**, every time communication with a person is terminated, the last communication time is set to the current time value in order to allow the device to determine when a reminder to call a person back should be sent to the user (Col 3 lines 63-67).

As per **claim 6**, the time interval is predetermined by the user (Col 3 lines 45-50).

As per **claim 7**, the alerting is done by a speaker vibrator or display (Col 3 lines 50-58).

As per **claim 15**, the device stores an alert list (Col 2 lines 15-30), and displays the alert list in the form of a menu on a display so that the user may select to make a call to the person (Col 3 lines 10-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 8-10,16,19,26** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazanin et al. (5625683), and further in view of Smith (5822400).

As per **claim 8**, Nazanin discloses a device as per the rejections of claims 1 and 3. His device is able to store a plurality of persons into memory. However, Nazanin does not mention dividing the plurality of persons into a plurality of groups and then determining the before-alert time interval for each group.

Smith (5822400) teaches that many businesses and customer service organizations utilize telephone systems that include the ability to process a large number of customer records by grouping them together into campaigns (Col 1, lines 11-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to divide the plurality of people into a plurality of groups and then determine the before-alert time interval for each group because this would give the system the advantage of being able to process the grouped users in a batch and enter account records (such as the before-alert time interval) much more efficiently.

As per **claim 19**, Nazanin in view of Smith discloses a device having an alert function that performs the functions described in the rejection of claim 8.

As per **claims 26**, claims rejected for same reasons as rejection of claim 19.

As per **claim 9**, claim rejected for same reasons as the rejection of claim 4.

As per **claim 10**, claim rejected for same reasons as the rejection of claim 5.

As per **claim 16**, claim rejected for same reasons as the rejection of claim 15.

6. **Claims 11,13,14,17,20,23,24,27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazanin et al. (5625683), and further in view of Groff (4405839).

As per **claim 11**, Nazanin discloses a device as per the rejections of claims 1 and 3. However, Nazanin does not mention storing an alert-inhibition time period in which alert is inhibited.

Groff teaches that a telephone subscriber desires to selectively silence the ringer of his telephone when he doesn't want to be disturbed. Based on this information, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement an alert inhibition controller so that it could silence the ringing without having to unplug the telephone (and risk forgetting to plug the phone back in) (Col 1, lines 11-43).

As per **claim 20**, Nazanin in view of Goff discloses a device having an alert function that performs the functions described in the rejection of claim 11.

As per **claims 23,24**, claims rejected for same reasons as rejection of claim 11.

As per **claims 27**, claims rejected for same reasons as rejection of claim 20.

As per **claim 13**, claim rejected for the same reasons as the rejection of claim 7.

As per **claim 14**, Groth additionally mentions that the alert-inhibition system may optionally inhibit only audio alerts in the telephone (Col 1 lines 50-55).

As per **claim 17**, claim rejected for same reasons as the rejection of claim 15.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 703-305-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 703-305-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9315 for After Final communications.

AJ
July 12, 2004



CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600